



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ployed than in any other subject, the results are in no wise satisfactory.

I leave out of consideration the whole question as to the value of modern languages from the disciplinary point of view as compared with the Classics. This subject has been adequately treated by Professor Bennett and others. There is, however, one phase which is noteworthy. Many teachers feel that Latin could be taught better if the child had a preliminary knowledge of French. I am not convinced that this is true, and am inclined to believe that the success of those who advocate it is their success and not the success of the system, but it has not really been tried sufficiently to form a judgment. G. L.

THE SCANSION OF VERGIL AND THE SCHOOLS

(Concluded from page 5)

The high school teacher, of course, will object that he has no time to do these things, that my words are simply once again the words of the visionary college teacher who does not understand the peculiar conditions that obtain in the high schools, or the burdens already imposed on the teacher there, or the demands already made on the time of the teacher in the class room work. The answer is easy. Let the student of Latin from the start be trained aright; let him be trained, as suggested above, in Latin words, pronunciation as well as form and meaning, and time will then be forthcoming for the teacher of Vergil in which to do the things demanded of him in this paper. The boy who knows 1,500 Latin words by the time he picks up his Vergil will find the reading of Vergil on the whole a far simpler task than the reading of Cicero and Caesar had been to him; syntactically Vergil is easier than Caesar or Cicero, and in point of subject matter certainly is interesting, if not markedly more entertaining. Such a boy's progress in the reading of Vergil would be rapid enough to leave time in plenty for the consideration of the metrical form. Further, the plan of requiring the student to analyze in writing a certain number of verses day by day for at least a part, if not the whole of his Vergil course, would add but little to the pupil's work of preparation and would take up *per se* no time from the class room work itself.

What of the rules of quantity? As already argued, right training in pronunciation, begun with the boy's first use of a Latin word and carried through every hour of his course, will bring the boy face to face with the scansion of Vergil with no problem of vowel quantity to deal with, except as now and again Vergil's reproduction of Greek phenomena of vowel quantity or rhythmical usage may introduce an element new to the lad's experience. For all other pupils common-sense methods should obtain. One should not attempt too much. Certain rules of quantity are fundamental, for example, those about the

quantity of final syllables and those about increment. These, together with the rules for 'position', will account for the larger part of all the syllables with which the student has to deal. Is the learning of these rules beyond the intelligence of the high school pupil?

In this connection I would again lay stress on a suggestion which I have made elsewhere, that much would be gained practically if in all our teaching of matters metrical we were to speak consistently of *syllables* as heavy or light and of *vowels* as long or short. Our present system applies precisely the same terms to two different things and is inevitably confusing¹. In the written analysis of verses the student can set the macron above the long vowel and underscore the syllable which is heavy, even though its vowel is short.

Something may be said concerning the oral reading of hexameter verse. One may admit that he is not prepared to state exactly what the Latin ictus was, that he has no clear understanding of how the Romans treated the coincidence or the non-coincidence of the ictus and the word-accent, that he does not know what the Romans did with the syllables we call elided syllables, that he gives to Latin verse as he reads it a stress accent rather than a quantitative treatment and yet not be wholly absurd in claiming that nevertheless Latin hexameters as he reads them still have rhythm.

If we view the matter in a purely practical way we shall admit, I think, that there are virtually no difficulties in verses in which there are no elisions. Verses like

Tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem,
or

Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso
quidve dolens regina deum tot volvere casus
insignem pietate virum, tot adire labores
impulerit

or Horace C. 1. 5 *passim* may be said to read themselves. In this connection the teacher would find it very helpful, it seems to me, to introduce his pupils to the hexameter via Lucan (texts of Lucan can be got for a trifling sum) because elision is much less frequent in Lucan than in Vergil and Lucan's verse is therefore easier to read.

What shall we do with the elision? Some years ago I listened to a discussion of this matter which was wholly iconoclastic and destructive, nay, even despairing in character.

The speaker confessed that he had come wholly to doubt and despair concerning the metrical reading of Latin poetry; he declared that he knew next to nothing concerning the manner in which the Romans read Latin verse and that other teachers probably knew no more about it than he; from all this he

¹ The present system induces good scholars to print such abominations as *pātris!*

drew the conclusion that "it is worse than useless—it is a sheer waste of precious time—for pupils in preparatory schools to attempt to acquire the art of reading Latin poetry".

In order to make clear his point of view he proceeded to emphasize the different views held by various scholars here and abroad (1) concerning the nature of the ictus, and (2) concerning the relation which in fact existed between the ictus and the word accent and the method to be employed by the moderns to bring out that relation (if we can determine it). He then set forth what he conceived to be the different systems of reading Latin verse laid down in the grammars, etc., published in this country, with oral illustrations of his conception of those methods. It was hard to believe that he was doing justice to these various methods; yet after all, though he was engaged in ridiculing them, strange to say, in every instance, against his own will and in absolute subversion of his own argument, he secured, to my ears at least, distinctly metrical and rhythmical results. One could not help wondering, as he listened, what results the speaker might attain if he should really try to secure metrical effects.

In further support of his contentions, the speaker argued that the prevalent method (such he called it) of making the ictus a stress accent and then of giving that stress accent fully without regard to the prose accent of the words (save where the prose accent and the ictus coincide) leads to sad results. By way of illustration he cited Aeneid 1. 76-77, complaining because *tuus* and *mihi*, which he regarded as the most important words in the whole couplet, do not bear the ictus and "must be hurried over without the slightest emphasis". But are they the most important words in the couplet? To me it seems rather that *regina* and *iussa* are the most important words in the passage. *Regina* reminds me forcibly of Juno's own words (46) *quae divom incedo regina*; Aeolus talks here to Juno exactly as if he had heard her whole speech to herself (37 ff.). The thought, then, in my opinion, is this: "you are QUEEN and have therefore only to determine your will; ORDERS are my portion."

Again, the speaker cited Aeneid 1. 46-48; here he complained because in 46 "the stress, instead of coming on *ego*, the most important word, comes on *ast*, a word that calls for no emphasis at all, as far as the sense is concerned. In the second line, instead of coming on the emphatic *soror*, the stress comes on the comparatively unimportant *et*". Instead of being so sure of his own position he had done better if he had stopped to ask himself the question, Did Vergil know his business? Assuming that Vergil knew what he was about, let us do what our speaker failed to do, i. e. let us examine the passage and discover the real meaning. Does *ast* call for no emphasis at all? We have just learned in six and a half verses

what Pallas was able to do when a single man sinned against her sacred majesty; we are to learn now of the impotence of Juno. *Ast* is to serve the rather important function of contrasting the coming account of the impotence of Juno, 'Jove's both sister and wife', to avenge the wrongs done her by a whole race with the dread vengeance exacted by Pallas for the sin of one man. Was Vergil foolish, then, in giving weight through the aid of meter to a word that plays so large a role? Again the speaker complained because in 47 the stress, "instead of coming on the emphatic *soror*, comes on the comparatively unimportant *et*". But is *et* unimportant? Does not the fact that *et* . . . *et* carry two ictuses bring out as nothing else could the duality of Juno? It is that duality which emphasizes her impotence. So far, then, as this portion of the contention is concerned, just one thing is to be said, that such considerations, instead of showing the uselessness of metrical study, show how absolutely essential it is to probe Vergil's verses deeply to get at their real meaning, how blind and halt the study of Vergil's verses is unless a large part is played by the very examination of the meter which the speaker, in a fit of despair, would have had us forego entirely.

The speaker then passed on to discuss the question of elision. He treated elision (1) as the absolute crushing out of the vowel and proved at length, what needed no proof at all, that the results obtained are often, to us moderns, absurdly unintelligible. But he fails to note that it by no means follows that the results reached by such a method would be equally absurd or unintelligible to the Romans. We all know the story told by Cicero De Div. 2. 84, that *cum M. Crassus exercitum Brundisi imponeret, quidam in portu caricas Cauno advectas vendens Cauneas clamitabat. Dicamus, si placeret, monitum ab eo Crassum caveret ne iret; non fuisse periturum si omni parvisset*. The identification of *Cauneas* with *cave ne eas* involves, it is plain, two cases of elision wherein the final vowel is completely crushed out. To this the speaker gave no heed; he gave no heed either to the extent to which in Italian poetry as delivered by Italians or in modern spoken Greek or Italian elision involves complete loss of the vowel, without absurdity or loss of intelligibility.

He then discussed (2) the other method of treating the elision, that of slurring the vowels together. He argued that "no modern scholar can slur the syllables together in such a way as to preserve the identity of each word without destroying the rhythm of the verse or doing violence to the temporal requirements of the verse"; he will get too many syllables. He made merry over the cases in which the elided syllable ends a speech and asks if we are to imagine two speakers in a rapid dialogue in a lively scene in comedy timing their utterances in such fashion that while the one is enunciating the concluding vowel of

his speech the other shall break in with the first vowel of his. We did not need proof that such a procedure is unthinkable. The speaker might have learned much had he pursued some such investigation as Mr. Magoun set forth in his four papers in *The Latin Leaflet* (Nos. 170-173). Mr. Magoun reminded us that we have to deal not merely with types of syllables, the two-time and the one-time syllable, which stand to each other in a wholly rational relation, but with syllables lighter than a light syllable¹ and heavy syllables less heavy than two beats². Had the disputant known or remembered these facts and had he summoned to his aid even an elementary knowledge of music, he had saved himself much writing. Feet in verse, as bars in music, have equal or approximately equal time values, but they need not contain exactly the same number of syllables. The syllable which *per se* is the lightest possible may in music receive any desired number of beats; conversely a syllable in itself heavy may in singing be but barely touched. Hence the method of slurring the vowels, which the speaker condemned, has justification in music. I take it that a trained singer slurring the vowels could deliver Latin verses in a way to show proper quantitative effects and a right division into bars or feet, i. e. in rhythmical fashion.

Finally, the disputant failed to note that all his criticisms apply only to the oral reading of Latin verse: they do not lie at all against the written analysis of verses such as Professor Johnston urges. Such written analysis is independent of any theory of ictus, and of any theory of the relation of ictus to word accent and elision, and is in no small degree instructive.

I have said enough, I hope, to show that the two methods of treating the elision mentioned in our books are not to be lightly laughed out of court by a despairing critic. Grant that we do not yet know

¹ Too many books have been written in ignorance of these facts, which were perfectly well known to the ancients (see e. g. Goodell, *Chapters on Greek Metric*, 6-57), and have been demonstrated afresh by modern psychological investigations (see e. g. an article in *Studies from the Yale Psychological Laboratory*, 9 (1901), 1-142, by J. E. W. Wallin, entitled *Researches on the Rhythm of Speech*. On page 31 we learn that phonographic records have shown "that the length of a given long or short syllable in modern languages is never absolutely fixed; the precise length is different for every time it is spoken". Mr. Wallin's paper in one long protest against the doctrine that in poetry as read, the feet are in fact equal each to each; see especially p. 125. Cf. also Charlton M. Lewis, *The Principles of English Verse*, 14. "Now in verse as in prose it must be observed that our instinct does not demand exact equality of the time intervals.... Indeed, to read verse in perfectly even time would be to make it insufferably monotonous. Children recite their Mother Goose in that way, because their instinct is strong and crude; but older persons are repelled rather than attracted by that kind of sing-song, and much of the beauty of verse, to a refined taste, is due to the perpetual checks and accelerations with which rhythm is varied". In the *Nation* of November 28, 1908, page 531, in a review of Josef Hofmann's recent book on *Piano Playing* I read: "The author warns against the use of the metronome, because the keeping of absolute time is thoroughly unmusical and deadlike".

² I would strongly urge all teachers of Vergil to read two highly illuminating papers by Professor M. W. Humphreys of the University of Virginia: (1) *The Influence of Accent in Latin Dactylic Hexameters*, *Transactions American Philological Association*, 1878, pp. 30-58 (one of the best papers ever written on the hexameter, far better than Munro's paper in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Volume 10, which appeared about the same time, advocating the same thesis); (2) *On certain Influences of Accent on Latin Iambic Trimeters*, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, 1876, pp. 107-145.

exactly how the Romans read their verses: shall we for that reason give up trying to discover? We do not yet know all the details of Latin syntax; shall we exempt our Latin pupils from all necessity of attempting to understand Latin syntax? The gospel of despair is surely not the friend of progress.

If the teacher is convinced that all this is beyond the high school pupil, let him then do this work for his own good. Let him seek in every way to quicken his own appreciation of such matters, to broaden and deepen his own sense of the importance of metrical studies; let him add in every possible way to his own stock of knowledge concerning such matters and then, inevitably, his teaching of so much of the subject as he holds to be within his pupil's apprehension will be more vital and more effective.

CHARLES KNAPP.

QUANTUM AN QUALE?

At the risk of triteness I wish to offer a few suggestions in regard to the status of classical studies at the present time.

That there is not manifested nor felt that interest in Greek and Latin, especially the former, that those seriously engaged in teaching these subjects would like to see is matter of common knowledge. It ought to be possible to indicate the reason, or a part of the reason, for this state of things.

In this age, in which success is measured largely by the size of the 'pile', the impression appears to be widespread that time spent in coming in contact with the misty past is time misspent. In many instances, it must be sadly confessed, that view is abundantly justified by the facts of experience, but is its truth to be ascribed to the nature of the subject or to the degree of contact?

'Put money in thy purse' is a parental admonition which, although notoriously disregarded during the period of college life, yet lies dormant in the mind of many a young man as a potent principle which will, after the wild oats are sown, open to him the door of success.

The temper of mind thus engendered is antagonistic, it is true, not only to the spirit of reverence for and delight in the intellectual creations of past ages, but also to any serious mental occupation which does not yield or promise immediate, visible, tangible and—as summing up the entire list of desirable attributes—practical results.

We ardently pursue the practical; we offer sacrifice on the altar of the practical. Be it so. But what is the 'practical'? The answer depends upon the point of view.

Is our youth to be encouraged to bend his best energies, all his energies, to the acquirement of that which, when acquired, so often turns to ashes in his grasp?